REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 14, 2008. Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1-10 stand rejected in the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1-10 have been amended.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed April 16, 2004.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge Applicant's claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified priority document. A certified copy of the priority document JP 2003-112543 has been filed along this Amendment.

The rejection of independent claims 1 and 6 as allegedly being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Takahashi et al. (US 6,354,944) is respectfully traversed. Takahashi fails to disclose or even remotely suggest each and every limitation set forth in the claims. Anticipation requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference", *Verdegaal Bro. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (MPEP § 2131).

Amended claim 1 (and equivalently claim 6 as well) now recites "wherein said viewpoint-location setting programmed logic circuitry sets the viewpoint-locations in such a manner so that each of operating objects selected by said selecting programmed logic circuitry is displayed to have approximately the same size". Support for the amendment can be found in page 16, lines 10-14 of the specification. Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest the above limitation.

Takahashi generally discloses an image processing device, where the location of a viewpoint is determined based on the location of an operating object (col. 8, lines 12-13). More specifically, a game character moves in a landscape, and Takahashi's method determines the

location of the viewpoint C corresponding to each new location of the game character (Fig. 6). The determination of the viewpoint is as follows. First, the location of a "focus" point A in front of the game character is determined (col. 8, lines 50-54). The distance d_{HAB} is predetermined and fixed (Fig. 4, col. 10, lines 18-25). Second, the line of sight is calculated by connecting the focus point A with a point-of-regard B located on the upper part of the game character's body (Fig. 4, col. 9, lines 11-17). Subsequently, the position of viewpoint camera is calculated by setting a distance d_{BC} between the point-of-regard B and the viewpoint C (Fig. 4). The distance d_{BC} is predetermined and fixed (col. 10, lines 18-25).

Application of the above method can be seen in Fig. 6. As the game character moves in a landscape (e.g., first going on an uphill slope, then on a flat path, and then down a deep valley), the location of the focus points A and the points-of-regard B change, thus setting the location of the various viewpoints C corresponding to the various positions of the game character.

In Takahashi's method, the viewpoint location is set in correspondence with the operating object. The viewpoint location is set at a predetermined distance behind the operating object and on a direction determined by the line of sight, e.g. a line between the focus point A corresponding to each position of the operating object and the point-of-regard B of the operating object.

Claim 1 now recites that even if respective game characters have different sizes, the game characters can be displayed to have approximately the same size. Takahashi's method does not offer this feature. Even though it teaches that the predetermined distances d_{HAB} and d_{BC} may be dependent on the size of the operating object, it does not teach that as the size of the operating object becomes smaller, the corresponding distance X becomes smaller, the corresponding angle becomes smaller and the corresponding height becomes smaller. It is this feature that makes all

the operating objects appear to have approximately the same size. Moreover, Takahashi is silent regarding the variation of the angle α. Even though the distance d_{HAB} may change as the height of the operating object changes (see Fig. 4), there is no teaching that the angle changes in such a way that it becomes smaller as the height becomes smaller. In fact, the obvious trend would be for the angle to remain the same, as the line segment AB is parallel translated with increase/decrease of the height of the object, thus resulting in an angle of the same value.

Regarding the limitation of claim 3, the Examiner cited col. 2, lines 18-21 ("This invention was devised in order to overcome problems of this kind, an object thereof being to provide an image processing device whereby an optimum viewpoint is automatically provided"), emphasis added, and col. 8, lines 8-12 ("The first mode of implementing the present invention automatically conducts optimum viewpoint adjustment by refereeing to the relationship between the player's character and the landscape in a process known as "camera coordination and angle determination""), emphasis added. These two cited passages refer to the method adjusting/optimizing the viewpoint during the movement of the game character in a varying landscape. For example, as the game character goes up a hill or down a hill, the viewpoint is adjusted so that a good view is always obtained (see col. 10, lines 49-62).

The Examiner also argued that "it would be necessary for the system to show all characters approximately the same size as to give all players the same viewing advantage in the playing field, where in a game of limited screen display, a larger character viewed from an avatar point, would cover the screen and make it impossible for the player to view his opponent", emphasis added. Takahashi is completely silent as to showing all game characters of different sizes as having approximately the same size. This is only achieved in claims 1 and 6 by varying the distance and the angle so that the distance and the angle become smaller as the size of the

object becomes smaller. This feature, which is necessary for the claimed invariance of displayed size, is not taught in Takahashi.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-10, each being dependent from claim 1 or 6, also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____

Leonidas Boutsikaris, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 61,377

LB:tlm
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100